

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

Overall Rating

4

### Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		184%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

### Non-Evaluative Comments

None.

### Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Redwood City, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Redwood City Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	22,558
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$10,103,707

# EVALUATION FORM

## Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

### Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

#### Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

RATING

4

4

N/A

#### Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

#### Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A  
N/A

R1	R2	R3

### Rating panel comments

Library construction date: No existing library.

Library renovation date:

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

### Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

**RATING**

**3**

#### Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

N/A

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
3	3	3
3	4	3
4	4	3
3	3	3

#### Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
3	4	3
4	4	3
3	4	3
3	4	3
4	4	3

#### Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
2	2	3
2	2	3
1	2	2

#### Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	4
2	3	3

#### Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2
1	2	1
2	3	3
1	0	1
2	2	2
1	1	2
2	2	2
0	0	1

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

#### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

##### **Needs Assessment:**

A very well done community analysis and analysis of service needs, demonstrating a desire to know the community and determine the appropriate library services for the residents. An exceptionally well documented space needs assessment, but could have been provided more discussion and detail specific to the project at hand.

##### **Plan of Service:**

The planned services respond very well to the needs assessment findings, and the goals and objectives are very well written. This should provide a good working document for staff who will be implementing and evaluating the services. The planning documents appear to be unhurried and genuinely directed toward providing quality library services designed for this clientele and not merely toward satisfying grant requirements.

##### **Joint Use Agreements:**

It is unclear from reading the two agreements exactly what the joint venture services will be. The agreements do not represent a long-term commitment. While there is a 10-year commitment to provide joint venture services in both agreement, there is also a termination clause in each that negates it by allowing parties to terminate the agreements upon a 6-month notice. The responsibilities for the joint services fall on the public library, with only informational events and training sessions being prepared jointly with the library and school districts. Hours of service are very good, but it is unclear from the agreement if staffing will be provided to assist students. The reviewer was left with the impression that the service provided might very well have been provided by the public library in the course of providing public library services to its user groups and that there may not have been a need for joint use agreements.

##### **Building Program:**

A reasonably well done general requirements section in the building program that could have used more detail and proof reading ("The intended occupancy of the building is [XX], [XX] patrons and [XX] staff"). Very well done spatial relationships narrative for some spaces and completely missing for other spaces. There is also a spatial relationships diagram, however, in several cases there appear to be inconsistencies between the diagram and the narrative in the space descriptions. Exceptionally well done space descriptions for some spaces juxtaposed with spaces that have no descriptions except the name, square footage and a list of furniture and equipment (Back Issue Periodical Collection, Fiction Collection & Seating, Group Study Rooms etc.). There is concern that not all of the spaces are appropriately sized. For example, Juvenile Fiction and Non-Fiction is called for in the collections summary, and these collections and their respective shelving and square footage is shown in the detailed space summary, but the juvenile collections, shelving, and square footage are missing from the Children's Collection and Seating space description.

##### **Conceptual Plans:**

The conceptual plans match the building program extremely well in terms of net-assignable square footage. Unfortunately, there is nothing on the plans indicating the amount of non-assignable space on the plans. The program called for 25% non-assignable, and it appears by adding up the net-assignable space on the plan and subtracting it from the total gross square footage in the application form, the plan may have approximately 22% non-assignable.

The conceptual plans appear to meet some of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program. For examples of problems, see the following exceptions: The Branch Manager's Office is not adjacent to the circulation workroom; the Circulation Desk is not particularly close to the public restrooms; the Janitor's Room is no where near the loading dock or staff restrooms; the Public Entrance & Lobby is not adjacent to the public restrooms, kitchenette as well as many of the meeting rooms, but they are accessible. Where is the Children's Entrance? The Fiction, Non-Fiction, and Juvenile Collections etc. are not shown on the plan - unable to determine if spatial relationships have been met. The Copy Center is not close to the Circulation Desk or Public Entrance and Lobby. Special Collections and Homework Center do not appear to be on the plans.

A book return room is mentioned in the spatial relationships for the circulation desk, but it is not present on the plans.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

R2:

#### **Needs Assessment:**

They used many and varied needs assessment methodologies that showed a solid attempt to get information from all of the community. This was also documented very well. The community analysis was also very well done, though a little sparse on community organizations and little connection between characteristics documented and potential library issues. They provided an exceptional analysis of service needs, which carefully details and analyzes the results of every type of NA method used. It is unique in the depth of analysis they provide, without lapsing into what the library has already decided to do about all of the needs defined. This just says what they learned and does not presume the library solutions. Those are left to the plan of service. The space allocations seemed appropriate for this stage in their planning. The Executive Summary provide an excellent overall summary, except that the K-12 description was pretty limited.

#### **Plan of Service:**

This seems to be a real working plan. There is an outstanding transition from the service needs defined in the Needs Assessment report. In addition, this includes a realistic and detailed implementation plan. The project seems extremely responsive to the needs of residents and K-12 students, and it is tremendously clear. They provide excellent sets of goals, objectives, activities (service indicators are contained within the objectives statements, as is appropriate. The types of services were extremely clear, well-documented, and responsive to the needs defined. This information added a useful level of information, not just a repetition of previously-stated data. They provided information which clearly showed how this effort fits into the jurisdiction-wide plan of service.

#### **Joint Use Agreement:**

The roles and responsibilities contain a lot of "collaborates," "co-sponsors," and "coordinates" on the part of the district. All real responsibilities are on the part of the library rather than the district. The services are described only as "party responsibilities," not what the end-user will receive. There was no staffing level provided for this service, only for the library, and no staffing was committed from the district. No funding commitment levels were defined. The annual review and modification process is adequate but certainly not active. The agreement is not really mutually beneficial. In addition, the agreement has a clause saying it can be terminated at any time upon six month's notice, so there is really no twenty year commitment here.

#### **Building Program:**

The Building Program describes the general requirements fairly well. More detail would have made it more clear as to what needs to be in the design. The bubble diagram is appropriate in describing the spatial relationships. A narrative would be helpful to give a more detailed description. The description of the individual spaces is moderately well done. For some of the areas, the full description is missing with only furniture listed. The fenestration, finishes, acoustics, HVAC requirements, accessibility are all needed by the architect in these areas to understand what the design needs to respond to.

#### **Conceptual Plans:**

The net assignable square footage is excellent in matching the Building Program with no more than 10% difference. The non-assignable square footage is well done. However, the actual net and non-assignable totals are not provided, so the reviewer had to calculate these from the gross square footage. The spatial relationships in the floor plan are highly effective in matching most of the requirements of the Building Program. However, there are places where there are discrepancies between the Building Program and what's on the plan, such as, the Homework Center/Technology Lab. and Interpretive Center.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

#### R3:

##### **Needs Assessment:**

The approach used to gather community input was multi-faceted and included: six focus groups, community forums, surveys, staff workshops, and surveys. Looked at the residents' use of other libraries in the area to determine current usage patterns. Good analysis of service needs. Utilized jurisdictional priorities to frame specific needs of the Redwood Shores Community.

##### **Plan of Service:**

Goals, objectives, and service indicators are well defined and clearly written. Findings from the needs assessment have been translated into a service plan that is functional. Branch services fit in with the overall jurisdictional plan.

##### **Joint Use Agreement:**

The proposed agreement does not lend itself to a sincere partnering effort. Statements used in the document refer to "collaboration", "co-sponsorship", and "coordination" with the end result being that the library is providing almost all of the service and the school district receives the benefits.

##### **Building Program:**

General requirements: Overall extensive, good guidance, but would help if more specificity was provided. E.g., Illumination does not specify levels or lamps; wire does not specify types; p. 7 has blanks to be filled in to state occupancies, but the numbers are not provided. Spatial relationships: Bubble diagram helpful and appropriate; sub-spaces fleshed out in room sheets. Visual control adjacencies not indicated.

Room sheets: Some of the material is adequate. Much of it is not provided at all. Furnishings requirements sometimes clearly present, with unit sq.ft. needs rolling up into total area space; other times nothing provided at all. There is conflicting information about where patron reserves will be handled (circulation desk or self-service). Staff workroom needs text describing activities; e.g., should there be a handsink to clean up after mending work? (Note that Bubble diagram (a) has a different term - "Staff workspace", and (b) notes a couple of the activities that may be provided here.). There is no functional description for the Friends / Facilities Service Desk.

##### **Conceptual plans:**

No tabulations of assignable or gross sq. ft. on drawings. However, the assignable sq. ft. of individual spaces very close to Program. Program total assignable sq. ft. is 16,667; no tally or total on drawing itself, but drawings cover sheet says total assignable sq. ft. is 75% of gross, and 16,919. Non-assignable sq. ft. is not in drawings. Application and drawings cover sheet say non-assignable sq. ft. is 22,558, slightly more than Program requirement of 22,223. Outstanding.

Spatial adjacencies. All match program, except that Library Office accessible only through workroom, contra Program p. 28. Children's area has 10 shelving units; program p. 18 requires 11.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

### ***Integration of Electronic Technologies***

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

#### **Integration of Electronic Technologies**

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

### **Rating Panel Comments**

R1:

The planning documents demonstrate both a clear understanding of the need for technology in providing library services and of the important of planning. A technology plan is provided with goals and objectives designed to utilize technology to serve a variety of public and administrative needs.

R2:

This is an outstanding, detailed, clear, and forward-thinking technology plan, including high end technological support initially and infrastructure defined to provide flexibility for future enhancements.

R3:

A very well done plan that addresses future expansion.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

### Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

#### Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
N/A		
4	4	4
3	4	3
3	3	3

#### Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	3	3
3	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3



4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

#### Rating Panel Comments

**Drainage issues:** All storm drainage that discharges into public waters is required to meet NPDES requirements. The existing perimeter levees surrounding Redwood Shores have already been upgraded to provide reliable flood protection for the entire Redwood Shores peninsula.

**Geotechnical issues:** The project site is feasible for the proposed library design. There is a deep (22') layer of bay mud immediately under the topsoil which will require an extensive foundation system. There is a cost premium associated with the foundation system which will require driven concrete piles. There is no other location on the Redwood Shores peninsula which does not have similar soil conditions.

R1:

Redwood Shores is a fairly isolated community that is physically detached from the City of Redwood City primarily by Hwy 101 and various sloughs. There are two freeway exits from 101 that form the only two ways in and out of the library service area: Redwood Shores Parkway and Marine Parkway. The site is located on the corner of Bridge Parkway (7,500 vehicles per day) and Marine Parkway (16,000 vehicles per day). The closest retail center (Market Place Shopping Center) appears to be located on Redwood Shores Parkway approximately 2/3's of a mile away.

The proposed site is not centrally located in the service area (it is in the far western end on the northern side), however it is located directly on one of the two main access routes in and out of the service area, so that residents will likely pass by it going to and from work, shopping or other trips around the area. Siting the library on one of these two major routes enhances access to everyone in the community. The Redwood Shores Lagoon runs down the middle of the service area forming somewhat of a natural barrier, however there are several passage ways over the lagoon, and the major one, Bridge Parkway, runs past the site toward the Market Place Shopping Center.

There are four public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site and a new bus stop will be added at the library site at the corner of marine and Bridge Parkways. Three buses which are serviced by Cal Tran as shuttles stop near the proposed site.

There is a bike and pedestrian trail called the Bay Trail runs along the Belmont Slough which is adjacent to the site. There will be 14 bike parking spaces near the front entry, but not sheltered.

There are 121 parking spaces on-site which meets the local code and appears to be ample for the proposed library. There will be 7 motorcycle spaces, and some spaces will be assigned to hybrid or electric vehicles and carpool vans.

The library will be highly visible from Marine Parkway and the site is 4 blocks from, and visible from, Hwy 101 which carries 220,000 vehicles per day.

The site is located near a major Oracle complex. The "gateway" site is located at the transition from business and commercial uses to residential uses. There is no other community oriented facility other than a fire station.

The proposed site is the only remaining undeveloped sites within the community. There were four open community forums where staff and residents developed criteria for the site. Architects and consultants reviewed the site and the possibility of adaptive re-use of other sites. The proposed site was selected primarily for its convenient access as well as the adequate size of the site to place the building and parking on.

The conceptual plans and application do not indicate any plan to expand either the building or parking in the future.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Redwood Shores Community Library 2061

#### R2:

Given the geography and travel patterns of Redwood Shores, this site is central in the sense of access. Scheduled bus service is at the corner of the site at the library entrance. Employer shuttles run in the first part of the morning and the last part of the afternoon throughout the area, available to all.

Bicycle and pedestrian access can be efficient, on sidewalks and roadways, or scenic, on paths along the slough. Can't lose. Signals, driveways and turnouts facilitate auto ingress and egress. Automobile parking meets code, has 14 bicycle stalls (unsheltered and unsupervised) and 7 motorcycle stalls (a first for this reviewer).

Siting right on Marine World Parkway is a very visible location. 30' roof peaks will be very noticeable. The library responds well to the desires of the community to have a library right at home, convenient to their kids' paths of travel as well as their own. It is a major community-owned facility, together with the school and the fire station.

Site selection process considered other sites, but various land use and other constraints made them infeasible. This site has the happy combination of feasibility and desirability, as seen by staff and consultants. Community involvement in site selection came after the decision, and has been positive.

The buildable land is between 5 and 6 times the size of the building footprint, definitely large enough in the abstract, but because of the configuration, just enough. The design nicely exploits the unusual shape and setting. The site reflects that in Redwood Shores there is no center of gravity which might be an attractive location in and of itself.

#### R3:

While not geographically centered in the peninsular service area of Redwood Shores, the proposed site is easily accessible to all area residents. There are four public transit stops within 1/4 mile, including a new stop that will provide direct access to the library entry plaza. The site is also served by private employer paid, accessible to the public, shuttle services. The site is immediately adjacent to Belmont Slough along which runs one of the bicycle/foot paths that form the extensive Bay Trail. Automobile access to on site parking is available from both Bridge Parkway and Marine Parkway, Highway 101 is four blocks away via Marine. Parking consists of 121 on site/off street spaces. There are 14 bicycle spaces provided, though none appear to be sheltered. The proposed library, raised above grade, and with several prominent architectural features, will be highly visible along Marine Parkway, one of only two entrances to the Redwood Shores peninsula. The site is well sized for the proposed project but future expansion would be difficult.

EVALUATION FORM  
**Redwood Shores Community Library 2061**

***Financial Capacity***

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

**Rating Panel Comments:**

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.